

Requirements from Domains: Medical Physics

16th Geant4 Collaboration Meeting
SLAC
19-23 September 2011

Physics Lists

- We've taken one of our our greatest assets, flexibility, and turned it into our greatest liability:
 - accomplished scientists feel stupid when they encounter Geant4 physics lists
 - makes them reluctant to try alternatives

Geometry

- We are unsurpassed
- but sometimes leave our users without needed guidance:
 - *** G4Exception : Notification
issued by : G4Sphere::DistanceToOut(p,v,..)
Undefined side for valid surface normal to solid.
*** This is just a warning message.
- Detracts from user confidence in our toolkit

Parallel Geometry

- Extremely valuable
 - And when we add Layered Mass Geometry, they are blown away
- Just need to finish the job
 - Optimize the CPU performance

Accuracy and Validation

- For a limited set of particles, energies, materials
 - Particles:
 - e- & gamma, to 25 MeV
 - proton to 250 MeV
 - Carbon to 400 MeV/nucleon
 - Materials:
 - materials of the treatment head
 - materials of the patient
- Users do not expect us to be perfect, but need to know where we stand
 - Clear explanation of materials, ionization potentials, special features in the code for G4_Water, etc.

Contributions from Medical Physics

- Medical Physicists are willing to help with ongoing validation tasks.
 - Quality Assurance is a routine part of every medical physicist's job
- They do not expect to get something for nothing
 - They will help get us experimental data
 - They will help run validation tests
 - They will help analyze validation results
 - And if they could understand our physics lists and models a little better, they would contribute to improving the models
- They will become full collaborators, taking real work off the rest of us

Stability

- Accuracy must remain same or improve over time
- Users are very distressed if we regress

Detailed Requests from GATE

- MT:
 - Very interested in MT prototype.
 - Selected by Intel Scientific Council.
Will hire a post doc. One year project.
- Validation:
 - They run many validations for proton and carbon.
 - Say physics models are not satisfactory.
 - Best results are with binary cascade + precompound off.
 - Can spot problems but do not have capability to fix them.
 - Would be glad to help on these issues and provide data.
- Materials:
 - Defining materials by themselves, setting same parameters as NIST materials, still get different results from NIST materials